HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 23 — Saturday, June 4, 1955 — Washington, D. C.

News Section — *Printed in Two Sections*

Immigration: A strong and concerted effort to scuttle the immigration laws is now under way. It is stemming from three sources.

(1) First is the President's recent message to Congress urging that the refugee Act of 1953 (209,000 more non-quota immigrants from Europe) be radically revised. To date some 11,000 refugees have been admitted. The President's proposals will rip away the restrictions imposed by Congress when it passed the Act so that the rest can pour in before the 1956 elections. Confidential sources say that the Presidential message was prepared by Max Rabb whose job in the White House is to keep minority groups in the Republican column — that the President hastily accepted Rabb's work and probably failed to realize its full import.

The message urged the following revisions: (a) Under the present law, every refugee must have at least two years of personal history that can be checked by security officers. This is to be wiped out although security experts have testified that 30 to 40% of all persons coming from behind the Iron Curtain are either subversives or have criminal records. The entrance of such persons would accordingly be greatly facilitated. (b) The present law excludes persons with tuberculosis. These with controllable TB are now to be admitted.

(c) The present law requires that each refugee be assured of a job and a place to live, so as not to displace American workers or intensify the existing shortage in low income dwellings. This is to be knocked out. (d) The present law excludes refugees firmly re-settled — persons who have become citizens of other countries. This, too, is to be scrapped. (e) The present law applies only to *refugees*. The Presidential proposal is that European nationals as well as refugees shall be eligible for admission — thus establishing a precedent for our relieving the pressure of surplus peoples in Western Europe who now number many millions.

(f) Under the present law, European governments must agree in advance to take back any refugee who gains admittance to the U.S. by fraud or misrepresentation and who is discovered thereafter to have been a Communist agent or a criminal while in Europe. This is to be done away with and we will have to keep such characters in the future. (g) It is estimated that there are from 3 to 5 million illegal entrants already in the U.S. It is proposed that the Attorney General be given power, in his discretion, to validate their illegal entrance — of any or all.

(2) On Capitol Hill two separate teams of Senators have introduced bills to follow up immediately the President's recommendations regarding the special immigration law of 1953 by striking hard at the roots of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act — the nation's basic immigration law. One group is headed by Ives and includes Saltonstall and Clifford Case. The other group is headed by Lehman and includes Humphrey, Douglas and Kefauver. These groups apparently seek to wipe the McCarran law off the statute books by mutilating it beyond recognition by the following proposals:

(a) Confidential reports of the FBI exposing immigrants can no longer be used to reject such immigrants unless they are made public. If this proposal were passed, the FBI's valuable immigration work would be ended, because the FBI cannot make public its confidential reports without drying up vital sources of information.

(b) Under the McCarran Act, Orientals in the Western Hemisphere have to be charged to the quotas allowed their countries of origin if they come to the U.S. If such quotas are filled they cannot come in. More than a million Orientals are in South America. It is now proposed that the McCarran

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law's restrictions on Orientals in South America be eliminated. There is thus posed the threat of an Oriental flood wave rolling into America via South America.

(c) Virtually all relatives of immigrants in the U.S., it is proposed, should be accepted automatically as non-quota immigrants — potentially an enormous expansion in the numbers who can be admitted annually under the existing quota system.

(3) A secret document is now in the hands of authorities. It emanates from the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born (oldest Communist front organization in the nation.) It says that some 100 organizations have recently been set up to bring about a repeal of the McCarran-Walter law. It states that the issue (that is, the camouflage) is "freedom of the press," since a number of editors of foreign language newspapers are facing deportation or denaturalization proceedings under the McCarran law. Our sources confirm that some 20 such editors are already booked and that their foreign language newspapers go to millions of the foreign born.

Observers say that, unless the people know what is happening and protest, many of the President's proposals will go through this session of Congress; and in the next session, it will be an easy job to strike down the McCarran law *in toto*. Fourteen Republican Senators headed by Senator Watkins have already endorsed the President's proposals.

Air Power Controversy: "We are losing the air power race with the Soviets," said General Bonner Fellers today to HUMAN EVENTS, "because the Administration's chickens are now coming home to roost. The unwarranted drastic cuts in the air budget, which Secretary Wilson made just two years ago this month, have throttled down air force procurement. And now that we know the growing strength of the Red Air Force, our own reduced output of fighting aircraft has suddenly stunned the public."

General Fellers, author of *Wings For Peace*, a study of air power, is a retired artillery officer whose grasp of air power came in 1940 when he was U.S. Military Observer with the British Forces in the Lybian Desert and the Nazis had control of the air. Some 50,000 copies of his book, which more than two years ago warned of the very danger we now face, have been distributed among Air ROTC students. Fellers served as military and war veterans' adviser to the Republican National Committee from 1947 to 1952.

"The Administration's 1953 five billion dollar cut in air power set the goal of our program back from 1957 to 1959. Meanwhile our Defense Secretary blandly assured the public that we were getting more air power for less money! And while we operated on a business-as-usual, 8-hour-work-day basis, the Soviet production was doggedly working on a 24 hour around the clock schedule. In defense of our 8 hour work day, the Secretary of Defense claims the one-shift program was established so that our industrial potential could be expanded in an emergency. But the truth is — *industrial potential and ground mobilization are meaningless unless we can win the battle of the air when war starts.*

"The recent Red Air Force Fly-by over Moscow was a fearsome disclosure of Communist air might."

Polio Vaccine: Now that some calm has descended on the polio vaccine situation, observers on Capitol Hill — after canvassing among members of Congress — come up with the following view:

Under the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Public Health Service, as an agency of the executive arm of the Government, has a responsibility to see that the vaccine is pure and safe for use, and thereby it is proper for the Service to inspect plants and testings. Beyond that, it is emphasized, Secretary Hobby's Department has no legal right to proceed. To allocate deliveries of the medicine, to provide money for free inoculations, to regulate where and how vaccination should be made — all that is outside of the Government agency's statutory powers. Such activities should be the responsibilities of the local physicians and local authorities.

Congressional opinion resists the idea that the Federal Government should take over and police the distribution of the vaccine. Apart from being a dangerous extension of Federal power, the idea raises questions as to its practicality. To police such an operation would either (1) require a host of Federal policing officers who, if they were laymen, would not be fitted to police the delicate and technical work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of doctors; or (2) organize physicians' associations, as Federal agents, to supervise the job. The first course is obviously absurd. The second is superfluous. For, in the last analysis, if such a nation-wide job were to be tackled, it would have to be directed by physicians or medical organizations. Therefore — the question is raised — why any Federal plan or Federal control at all? Let the localities work through the American Medical Association or local organizations of physicians.

Meanwhile some grass-roots reactions are coming in, such as the following from an Indianapolis *Star* news story (May 25):

"When politicians and bureaucrats tried to make a Hollywood production out of the distribution of Salk anti-polio vaccine, they created the present national scandal, a county health officer charged yesterday.

"Dr. Harry E. Murphy, Johnson County health officer, fixed the original responsibility on Basil O'Connor, President of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. Murphy accused O'Connor of pushing the distribution date to start on the anniversary of President Roosevelt's death on April 12. Then Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon and other bureaucrats got into it with the present result, Murphy said."

Desegregation: The Supreme Court opinion on the desegregation process, at first hailed as moderate — with only sporadic opposition in the South — seems to have been less moderately received than was expected in the North. Thus, Prince Edward County in Virginia — one of three counties in the nation cited in the Court's opinion of Tuesday — has revolted. The county board of supervisors immediately, after announcement of the court decision, refused to vote funds for continuance of the county school instruction for the term beginning September. The board has been urged by many residents not to approve funds that might be used to finance integrated schools.

This action — or rather spectacular inaction — caused no little furor in a state of the South not usually regarded as "hot-headed" on the subject. One of the principal newspapers of the State, the Richmond *News-Leader*, however, had some "hot words" to say. That paper (owned and operated as one publishing concern with the Richmond *Times-Dispatch*) has a high reputation in the nation. Douglas Southall Freeman, biographer of Lee and Washington, was long its editor. The well-known Virginius Dabney is presently editor of the *Times-Dispatch;* Mr. James Kilpatrick — who recently wrote "Not to be Solved on a Slide Rule", a study of the desegregation situation for HUMAN EVENTS — is now the editor of the *News-Leader*.

The latter paper said editorially on June 2, after outlining a number of steps obviously not intended to lubricate the way for early integration:

"Is all of this to advocate that Virginia attempt, by lawful means, to get around the law?

"That is exactly what we advocate.

"For let this be said once more, in unmistakable language: In May of 1954, that inept fraternity of politicians and professors known as the United States Supreme Court chose to throw away the established law. These nine men repudiated the Constitution, spit upon the Tenth Amendment and rewrote the fundamental law of this land to suit their own gauzy concepts of sociology. If it be said now that the South is flouting the law, let it be said to the high court, *You taught us how.*

"From the moment that abominable decision was handed down, two broad courses only were available to the South. One was to defy the court openly and notoriously; the other was to accept the court's decision and to combat it by legal means. To defy the court openly would be to enter upon anarchy; the logical end would be a second attempt at secession from the Union. And though the idea is not without merit, it is impossible of execution. We tried that once before.

"To acknowledge the court's authority does not mean that the South is helpless. It is not to abandon hope. Rather, it is to enter upon a long course of lawful resistance; it is to take lawful advantage of every moment of the law's delays; it is to seek at the polls and in the halls of legislative bodies every possible lawful means to overcome or circumvent the court's requirements. Litigate? Let us pledge ourselves to litigate this thing for fifty years. . . .

"Yesterday's opinion of the Supreme Court ended nothing. It changed nothing. And if it be said that the court's opinion was conciliatory, we would reply that the South is no more of a mind to conciliate on Wednesday than it was on Tuesday. When the court proposes that its social revolution be imposed upon the South 'as soon as practicable,' there are those of us who would respond that 'as soon as practicable' means never at all."

In Washington, observers are more alertly scanning the southern horizon since perusal of this editorial and speculating as to political effects of such reactions in Dixie, if the Prince Edward County experience is typical of feelings "down there." Are the newspapers of the North correctly and

(See column 1, page 4)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fully reporting the real situation, or is there a "play-down?"

Another question asked is: "How can the Democratic Party South hang together with the Democratic Party North, if the latter supports coercive measures against such actions as those taken by the Virginia county board?"

Labor Front: While Reuther and Ford battle, foreign diplomats here offer the following observations and suggest a parallel between the GAW plan and a similar experience abroad:

Mussolini put into effect in Italy many of the reforms that have been urged by Walter Reuther: cradle-to-grave security, public housing, rent control, price control and other measures discouraging private initiative and promoting Big Government.

In Italy, the beginnings of the guaranteed annual wage (GAW) came under Mussolini who like Reuther insisted in his innumerable speeches that he was the True Friend of the Working Man. Mussolini ordered employers to keep their men — whether needed or not — on the payroll. He made up the deficits either by giving government orders or by buying stock in the companies. (By 1945 the government owned or controlled more than 2,000 major Italian enterprises — and still does.)

Full employment became the Ten Commandments under Mussolini and all else was subordinated to it. To keep everybody fully employed where he was, cartels had to be allowed to fix prices, allocate orders and prevent entrance of new companies in their field or the unauthorized expansion of old firms.

Mussolini's "Guaranteed Annual Wage" philosophy has dominated the governments that have followed him. A law passed in 1947 virtually prohibited the laying off of employees with more than a year's seniority. But like so many unsound laws, its effects have been the opposite of its intentions. Writing in *Harper's* magazine, Peter Drucker says: "The law is the cause for a very large part — maybe a quarter, if not a third — of Italy's chronic unemployment, the worst in Europe. For very few employers will hire new workers. Even if he has to meet a tremendous demand for his product, an employer will prefer to pay ten hours' overtime each week at double and triple wages — as a manufacturer of Italy's ubiquitous motor-scooters has done — rather than bring in new people; for, once hired, they stay on the payroll forever, regardless of future business. Or the employer, like Italy's largest power company, will string out a five-year building program over ten or fifteen years rather than hire new crews, despite a crippling power shortage and constant brown-outs. In fact, no Italian employer could easily take on additional workers as long as his present employees do not want to share — and inevitably dilute — their own security. Everybody in Italy, the unions included, knows perfectly well that the guaranteed annual wage has become a deadly disease. Yet no one, not even the secretary of the Manufacturers Association, dares criticize it in public; for, being 'security,' it has become untouchable."

Today Italy's standard of living, low though it is, depends upon continuation of hundreds of millions received from the USA. Who will subsidize America when Reuther succeeds in making this country a carbon copy of Italy?

Two State Departments: That is the term now being increasingly used in Washington to illustrate the dual and conflicting control of foreign policy by two elements in the Capital. On the one hand, there is the regular State Department — now somewhat purged of the old Acheson elements, and run by Dulles and Undersecretary Herbert Hoover, Jr. This State Department sought to stave off a Big Four conference and to maintain U.S. support of the Quemoy and Matsu islands against possible Red Chinese aggression. It lost the argument to the "other" State Department which is popularly supposed to consist of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Nelson Rockefeller and Harold Stassen, all "liberals," and the first two of whom were figures in the New Deal Democratic Administrations.

In the past week, two developments were noted, to confirm this view of the way things are going. Secretary Dulles is reported to have held some more off-the-record conferences with the press, since the Tory victory in England, minimizing the importance and indeed the possibility of any Big Four conference and emphasizing the necessity of preliminary conferences if a Big Four conference were to have any constructive outcome.

But a succeeding development indicated that the "other State Department" was not idle. Last week, the President was slated to take a trip to the northeastern states later this month to see political leaders there and make speeches. He turned down a bid to go to the Pacific Coast to attend a decennial celebration of the founding of the United Nations. (We know of one New England member of Congress who cancelled social engagements in Washington to be on hand in his home state to greet the President.)

Then, came the change. The President suddenly on May 31 announced he would go to San Francisco for the UN affair. In the Capital the shift was attributed to the internationalist "Second State Department," to bolster domestic sentiment for the UN.

Additionally, we learn, Dr. Milton Eisenhower is slated to make a trip to Formosa in July — ostensibly to inspect an exchange student fellowship set-up in which he as President of Penn State College has participated. The inference drawn by our informants is that Dr. Eisenhower will look over the political situation and might conceivably say something for the press which would buttress the appeasement arguments for a "two-China" policy.

Letter from HENRY HAZLITT, *Newsweek* "Business Tides" columnist: "HUMAN EVENTS is one of the very few periodicals published in America that talks sense to the American people about what is going on in Washington. It is a relief to turn to it from the miasma of sentimentalism, demagoguery, or hysteria so commonly encountered and find oneself in the bracing air of fact."

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 23 HUMAN EVENTS June 4, 1955

Article Section

WHAT DID JESUS BELIEVE ABOUT WEALTH?

By REV. IRVING E. HOWARD

SOMEONE HAS OBSERVED that no generation of Americans has thought more about freedom than ours, and none has shown a greater readiness to abandon it. This is especially true in the realm of economics. The crux of the problem of economic freedom is the nature of wealth and man's right to it.

In view of this, it is important to consider what Jesus thought about wealth. Since He was concerned with life and since economics is involved in the whole of life, we should expect to find economic implications in the teachings of Jesus. This expectation is not disappointed.

Consider Jesus' parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Matthew 20:1-6). Here is the story of an employer who hired a series of laborers at different hours of the day and at the end of the day paid them all alike. When those who had worked the longest complained because they had not been paid more than those who worked for an hour, the employer answered: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?"

Whatever theological meaning this parable may have, it clearly assumes that a man has a right to his property. This is not a surprising assumption for Jesus to have made, for it was a central idea in the Ten Commandments and was a part of the Judaism of Jesus' time. Much so-called social legislation is in conflict with the teachings of Jesus on the question of property, for this kind of legislation is usually founded upon the assumption that a man's property or wealth belongs to the community, and that the community has a right to determine how it should be used. Jesus had a different idea; namely, that ultimately, all property belongs to God. More about that later.

JESUS also had a more constructive thought about the nature of wealth than "share the wealth." "Tax the Rich" legislation assumes that there is a fixed amount of wealth which must be more evenly distributed throughout the economy if we are to have a "just" social order. Our Marxian graduated income tax operates upon that principle.

Jesus' theory of the nature of wealth corresponds to that of the classical economists. Both were expounding something that is written into the nature of things and is therefore unchangeable.

The classical economists taught that there are four ways to get property or wealth. It may be created by the sweat of one's brow or the use of one's talents. It may be traded for, received as a gift or taken by force. In simpler days, when people were so naive as to believe the Ten Commandments, taking property by force was called "stealing." In more recent times, however, we have been led to think that what may be wrong for the individual is right for government. According to this philosophy, if by majority rule,

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the government takes property by force, the fact that the majority voted for it, makes it not an act of theft, but an expression of "social consciousness."

No one who is serious about the teachings of Jesus can ever be happy with this socialistic teaching. Not only did Jesus not believe in stealing, he did not believe that wealth was static. Study the parable of the ten pounds. Here Jesus told the story of a nobleman who gave his ten servants one pound each before he left for the far country. Upon his return, he called them to account. All but one had invested and increased his pound. This servant had hoarded his in fear that he might lose even that one pound. His lack of enterprise was condemned (Luke 19:11-28).

Thus, from Jesus' point of view, if one man has less wealth than another, he may get more, not by robbing the man who has more, but by creating some for himself. The only limitation upon the amount of wealth in existence is in man's ingenuity for creation. In this parable, the more the servants made on their investment, the more they were applauded and there is no suggestion that there was anything immoral in their creation of wealth. Only sloth, fear and hoarding were condemned.

In "The Religious Foundations of Economic Progress," published in the *Harvard Business Review* of May, 1952, Kenneth Boulding, economist, commented upon the gospel of self help which has been largely lost from modern Protestantism. "Part of the cause," he wrote, "lies in sheer misunderstanding, stemming from failure to appreciate the ethical significance of economic progress, and a resultant economic ethic based on static assumptions, in which undue stress is laid on distributing a fixed sum of wealth fairly rather than on increasing the total to be distributed." We might add: "distributed by the method of the free market."

To be sure, Jesus' concept of wealth was in the framework of the Old Testament doctrine of the sovereignty of God: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Thus, man is a steward over his wealth and is obligated to use it to the glory of God. Man has an account to render.

However, he renders his account to God. If man is responsible to society, as suggested by the World Council of Churches, the door is opened to totalitarianism. Society can become demonic! Our Founding Fathers were aware of the danger of a despotism of the majority growing up among us, and therefore tried to construct a government of checks and balances which would restrain majorities by a concept of justice. They saw something beyond society as the source of man's freedom, dignity and responsibility!

IN ADDITION to His idea of stewardship, Jesus' attitude toward wealth was conditioned by an otherworldliness. He was not primarily interested in this present world, but in a world to come.

Therefore, when a man came to Jesus saying: "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me," Jesus rebuked the man and refused to be an equalizer of wealth. He continued by warning the man against covetousness.

Jesus had not heard about the Social Gospel, so his response to this challenge did not reveal an "enlightened social consciousness." It is odd that the covetousness Jesus warned against so frequently has been turned into a virtue by the Social Gospel and Social Action movement in the modern church.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jesus followed his warning against covetousness with the parable of the rich fool who built ever larger barns only to die suddenly unprepared for eternity (Luke 12:13-21). To Jesus, wealth was a threat to the soul of the possessor, not a problem to be solved by social engineering. His focal point was always upon the individual rather than the group. While what he said to the individual had wide social consequences, he always started with the individual. So how to use wealth was a problem for the individual to solve with a sense of stewardship to God.

Consider the Rich Young Ruler who asked Jesus what he should do to inherit eternal life. Jesus recited the Ten Commandments to which the Rich Young Ruler replied: "I have kept these from my youth up." To prove that he had not understood the full implication of them, particularly of the first, Jesus replied: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, give to the poor . . . and follow me." Note that the point of emphasis in this incident was not upon the welfare of the poor, but upon the welfare of the Rich Young Ruler's soul. He had made a god of wealth (Matthew 19:16-26).

JESUS was for neither the poor nor the rich. He was for all men as individuals. Most of all, he was for their spiritual development and commanded charity as a means to that development.

In Jesus' hands, the Old Testament doctrine of the sovereignty of God became a warm, personal faith in the providence of God. While expounding upon God's willingness to care for those who trust Him, Jesus enunciated one of the greatest truths of the New Testament: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matthew 6:33).

The order of this verse is exceedingly important. Seeking the fulfillment of one's economic needs is not evil, but it must be secondary. When God is kept first, Jesus promises that man's economic needs will be met. Many historians have observed that at the root of the amazing economic development of western civilization have been deep seated religious convictions about God, man and the universe, especially the conviction that man is a morally responsible individual accountable to God and who therefore should be free to make choices and suffer the consequences. Thus, the futility of trying to transplant western know-how to lands which have not accepted the western know-why. When such countries master western know-how without the religious world view which inspired it, those countries have invariably become a frankenstein of political despotism. All forms of coercive socialism, which put materialistic, economic considerations first and spiritual considerations last, invite disaster.

Man's accountability to God in the use of his wealth obligates him to practice charity which was the point of the story of Dives and Lazarus. The rich man in this story was punished, not because he was wealthy, but because he did not have compassion upon the beggar at his gate. Nevertheless, there is no suggestion in this story that Lazarus had any claim upon the rich man's wealth (Luke 16:19-31).

Emil Brunner has stated it well in *Justice and the Social Order*: "(Man) is obliged, not by justice, but by compassion to give to those who are in need out of what is entirely his property, but those in need have no right to it. . . ."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The best known example of Jesus' insistence upon charity is the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). A close examination of this story reveals that while it was given in answer to the lawyer's question — "Who is my neighbor?", it answered an unasked question — "Who is it that acts neighborly?" In *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus,* Dr. Henry Joel Cadbury made the point that Jesus shifted the emphasis from the recipient to the doer of the deed, but Jesus actually went beyond that. Jesus emphasized the motivation of the doer of the deed. The spirit of compassion was more important to Jesus than the act of getting a wounded man taken care of on the Jericho road.

These distinctions are vital. Too frequently we have made the mistake of thinking that Christian ethics is concerned only with the objective deed, the consequences, rather than with the subjective motivation.

Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Secretary of the World Council of Churches, has criticized our American tendency in this regard: "When the objective deed is valued in the social result rather than in its motivation, it becomes possible to interpret a number of manifestations of social life as Christian (because of their apparent social value) that in the conception of ethics which stakes everything upon the inner attitude would never deserve the name."

"The greatest treason," said Thomas à Becket in *Murder in the Cathedral,* "is to do the right thing for the wrong reason." Much social welfare legislation provides us with examples of both wrong things and wrong reasons.

IT USED TO be the fashion to complain that the church had ignored the social implications of the teachings of Jesus. The complainers then proceeded to demonstrate that Jesus' teachings implied socialism. Now that many people are taking a second look at those teachings, they are finding that they do imply a social message, but that message is one of individual responsibility, freedom and the right to private property.

With a cry of alarm, ecclesiastical experts now warn that we must never seek to identify the ethic of Jesus with any civilization. Indeed! Is it permissible to discover that Christianity produced the healthy and admirable values in our society?

If the teachings of Jesus are not relevant to the problems of life in any age, then Christianity is indeed bankrupt. But Christianity is not bankrupt! It is socialism that is bankrupt for new ideas. The teachings of Jesus are still relevant and contain the truth that makes men free. Man is a spiritual being, not a materialistic mechanism. Man is responsible to God beyond all other authorities. As such, man has inalienable rights to life, liberty and property, which rights no government can give and no government should take away. This is the true Social Gospel.

Rev. Irving E. Howard is a Freedom Foundation award winner. He was formerly pastor of the Hope Congregational Church, Worcester, Mass., and is now on the staff of *Christian Economics* magazine for which this article was originally written.

Send copies of this important article to (1) your minister, (2) the officers and the most active members of your church, (3) the editor and the editorial writer of your newspaper, (4) the teachers in your city, (5) local union leaders.

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED